BX
5935
R3
1887

Class BX 5935
Book .R3
1887
PRESENTED BY

Why I am a Churchman.

THE

PITTS STREET CHAPEL LECTURE,

IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION,

"WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN."

BY THE

RT. REV. GEO. M. RANDALL, D.D.,

BISHOP OF COLORADO.

140TH THOUSAND.

NEW YORK:
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY,
31 WEST 23D STREET.

WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN.

THE

PITTS STREET CHAPEL

LECTURE,

IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION.

"*WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN.*"

BY THE

RT. REV. GEO. M. RANDALL, D. D.,

BISHOP OF COLORADO.

Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you.—1 *Peter* iii. 15.

NEW YORK

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY

31 WEST 23D STREET

1887

BX5935
.R3
1887

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858, by
JOHN P JEWETT AND COMPANY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Gift
W. Koenig
Ap'09

PREFACE.

THE occasion of the delivery of this Lecture was on this wise: —

An association connected with the "Pitts Street Chapel," (a Unitarian place of worship, in this city,) invited clergymen from six denominations to preach a course of sermons, last winter, in defence of the distinctive principles of the religious bodies which they represented. Having been requested to deliver one of that course, I accepted the invitation; and in this Lecture, stated the reasons WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN.

Some have expressed a doubt, whether it were precisely becoming in a Church Minister to engage in what, to their eye, appeared to be an *Ecclesiastical tournament*.

In this course of Lectures, there was neither *union* nor *controversy*. Hence there was neither compromising nor fighting, on the part of the preachers. On the Sunday evening assigned to me, the pulpit was mine, exclusively, for the time being. I had been invited to defend the faith and practice of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and I was expected to do this as fully and as forcibly as I would do, or could do, in my own parish Church. There was to be no delicacy of feeling, nor embarrassment of utterance, arising from the fact that I stood in another man's pulpit, and was addressing a congregation, a very large majority of whom were not Episcopalians.

Here was an opportunity for the Episcopal Church to have a hearing, such as she never before had in New England. We were challenged to tell our story, as plainly as we pleased, in the open ears of a multitude, who never

before heard the Church argument, and who were willing to sit and listen to it, patiently and respectfully. Shall this opportunity be improved? Shall the Church be heard in the heart of New England? To my mind, there never was the shadow of a doubt, as to the course which I ought to take. I believed it to be not only right, to accept the invitation and plead for the Church, but a bounden duty, which I was not at liberty to decline.

The results of that humble effort, which have already come to my knowledge, have confirmed the conviction, that in delivering this Lecture, I acted the part of a consistent Churchman, and a faithful soldier and servant of Christ.

This Lecture was first published in a volume, in connection with the other Lectures of the course. To such a publication, grave objections have been urged. On the other hand it is to be remembered, as a matter of compensation, that *thirteen thousand* copies of this book have already been published. At least ten thousand of these have gone into the hands of persons who are *not* Churchmen. On the supposition that each copy has been read by ten persons, we have this result: *one hundred thousand persons* have read the *Church argument* who never read it before, and who, but for this volume, might never have read it at all. Moreover, these volumes are still in circulation, and will be more or less read every day, for years to come, while new editions will undoubtedly be issued. There is surely some advantage in this, the fruits of which the Church will, no doubt, ultimately reap.

This Lecture is now issued by itself, in a tract form, in the hope that, with the blessing of God, it may be the means of some good.

G. M. R.

Boston, 1858.

WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN.

THUS SAITH THE LORD, STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS. — Jer. vi. 16.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH. — 1 Tim. iii. 15.

HOLD FAST THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS. — 2 Tim. i. 13.

THE object of this discourse is to indicate the distinctive principles of the *Protestant Episcopal Church*. The enunciation of these is a sufficient answer to the question: Why I am a Churchman, — and cannot preach the Gospel in any other ecclesiastical organization.

There is, and since the days of Abraham, there ever has been, such a thing, on the earth, as the *Church of God*. He originated it, — He governs and protects it. It is His instrumentality for the reformation, — the regeneration and the salvation of a fallen world. It is that Kingdom which Christ has

promised to be with, to the end of time, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. God wrote its constitution, appointed and commissioned its officers. As man did not originate this organization, so he can neither abrogate nor modify it. He can neither establish the terms of admission nor clothe its rulers with power. If, then, the Church in its origin and authority is in no sense *human*, — and is in every sense *divine*, — we must look for its features, in the only book, where God has written out His will, touching the salvation of men. That Book is the *Bible*. Here, if any where, must we find the charter of the Church. Here the boundaries of this great kingdom are defined. Here the titles and functions of its officers, their authority and their duties, are declared.

The world is divided into two great classes: those who are within this Kingdom, and those who are without it. There is no neutrality in the great contest between a righteous God and a rebellious world. Every man is either an adopted citizen in this great commonwealth of grace, or he is an alien. "He

that is not with me is against me," is the declaration of Christ.

The lines which mark the boundaries of God's Kingdom have been drawn by His own finger, for the darkened eye of the sinner. This fact, of itself, is sufficient to warrant the conclusion, that this demarcation is so distinct and definite, that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein," and "he that runs may read." The Church then is God's Kingdom on earth, protected and preserved by the abiding power of His own promised presence, and may be as readily recognized by the description contained in the Scriptures, as any earthly kingdom may be known by its Constitution and Statute Book. If there be "no other name given among men, whereby we must be saved," but the name of *Christ*, and the Church is "Christ's mystical body," then it follows, that the sinner must know *where*, as well as *how*, to look for refuge from the power and penalty of sin. He is not to be sent in search of an *invisible* ark.

The Israelites knew when they crossed the line, and entered "the promised land." The

penitent prodigal knew when his father kissed him, and when his trembling feet crossed the threshold of that father's house.

God made a covenant with Abraham, and with his seed, and with nobody else. This covenant was simple. The seal was definite. The conditions were explicit. All who received the seal were thereby made parties to the covenant. All who were in the covenant were in the Church, and all who were out of the covenant were out of the Church. From Abraham to Christ, no person could mistake the Church of God. No intelligent man could be at a loss where to find this divinely-ordained society.

From Moses to John, it was equally plain who were the administrators of this Kingdom; by whom appointed — their authority and their functions.

God chose the tribe of Levi as the ministerial tribe. Of them, He took the family of Aaron, as the priestly family; of these, He selected one for the high priesthood. Thus was the Church of Jehovah furnished with a ministry, whose authority came with the great seal of heaven. And although this

priesthood did not always please a Holy God, yet no other class of men, however learned or godly, were permitted to perform their sacred duties.* Thus were the people saved from all confusion in their inquiries for the Church, and for the divinely-ordained men, who, alone, were empowered to offer sacrifices in behalf of the people, and to teach them the way of life.

In the fulness of time, God Himself descended from His throne to His footstool. Here He lived as a man among men. "He came not to destroy, but to fulfil." His mission was to complete the plan of redemption. It was no part of His gracious errand to abrogate His own Church. There never had been, and there never was to be, more than one Church.

"He brought life and immortality to light;" fulfilled prophecy; became the imbodiment of all types and figures; put an end to all sacrifices by the sacrifice of Himself. He changed the *seal*, but left the covenant itself untouched. The "*tree*" which He had planted remained, though "the nat-

* Numbers xvi.

ural branches were broken off," and the branches of "the wild olive tree were graffed in." *

The Jewish Church had the *Scriptures*, — the *Priesthood* and the *Ordinances*. By these it was every where and by all known as "the Church of the living God."

In Christ the Levitical Priesthood found its complement. In Him that Priesthood ended, and with it, the sacrificial services of the Temple.

From Christ, the Great High Priest, went forth the Gospel, and from Him went forth the commission to men to preach it, and to administer its ordinances. There was no break in the great chain of grace. The covenant continued as in the beginning. The old Church was not pulled down that a new one might be built up. The Kingdom of Christ was to be known, as the Mosaic Church was known: by the *Word*, — the *Ministry* and the *Ordinances*. Wherever these were, there was "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth." If the dark line of the "Law" was sufficiently distinct,

* Rom. xi. 17–24.

to mark the pale of the Jewish Church, much more clearly would the bright borders of Christ's Kingdom be defined, by the shining of the Sun of Righteousness. It would, indeed, be most extraordinary, if the Church of Christ should be *invisible*, "when the darkness was past" and the "*True Light*" was now shining in all its uneclipsed splendor.* If there were certain infallible marks, by which the *Legal* Church was to be identified, it would be more than marvellous if there were not marks equally infallible, by which erring men might unerringly distinguish the *Gospel* Church, from every form of human society.

Christ appointed and sent forth twelve men, whom He denominated His Apostles, — as the Chief Ministers in His Church; investing them with authority to preach His Gospel, administer the Sacraments, and exercise discipline, in His Kingdom. He, moreover authorized them to send others, in His name, with like powers. He also sent forth the "*Seventy*," to preach His Word.† Here,

* *One "field,"* Matt. xiii., 24–30; *One "net,"* 47, 48.
† Luke x. 1.

then, as under the Old Dispensation, we find three grades of the Ministry: *Christ*, the *Apostles*, and the *Elders* or the "*Seventy*."

On the night of the Saviour's betrayal, He instituted the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*. Just before His ascension, He gave to His Apostles their great commission, "to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Holy Trinity." * Their authority to go, and to send others, came to them in these words which constituted a commission that can never expire, until the Church has done its work in the conversion of the world: "*As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*" †

Christ did not call His Disciples together and organize them into a Church, and then direct and empower them to elect and ordain their own ministers. He did not do thus, because these ministers were *His* ministers — the ministers of God; and their successors, to the end of the world, were to be *His* ministers, deriving all their power and authority as such from Him, and from Him alone. In

* Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. † John xx. 21.

accordance with this commission, the Apostles, soon after the ascension of the Saviour, proceeded to ordain a class of ministers, called *Deacons*, whom they empowered to preach and baptize.* Here again appears the threefold ministry: *Apostles*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*. Why God saw fit to have *High Priests*, *Priests* and *Levites* in the Jewish Church, it is not for us to say. It might have pleased Him to appoint *one* order, and in that case, one order would have been enough. But for wise reasons He saw fit to have *three*, and therefore neither one order nor two orders would have answered the end of the Priesthood. This matter of the Threefold Priesthood was not a notion of Moses, but a fiat of God. Why Christ saw fit to establish a similar numerical distinction in the ministry of the Church, I do not know. All we know about it is the fact, and that is all we need to know.

The Saviour was on the earth for the space of forty days after His resurrection and before His ascension. During this period, He instructed His inspired Apostles

* Acts vi. 3-6; viii. 5, 12, 38. 1 Tim. iii. 8, 10-13.

in matters pertaining to His Kingdom. Christ promised that the Comforter, whom He should send, which was the Holy Ghost, would teach them all things.* He told them to remain in Jerusalem until they had received the baptism of the Holy Ghost.† On the day of Pentecost, the Spirit was poured out upon them.‡ While they were yet inspired with the Holy Ghost, and so were taught by it, they ordained men to the third or lowest order of the ministry.§ This distinction was, therefore, not a mere fancy of the Apostles. It was the revealed mind of the Great Head of the Church, in beautiful harmony with the mind of the unchangeable God, as it had been heard and heeded by "Moses and the prophets." For aught we know, *one* order of the ministry in the Christian Church might have been as good as *three*, and it certainly would have been as good, if Christ had seen fit so to ordain. But He was pleased to appoint *three* orders, and therefore neither *one* nor *two* are or can be sufficient.

It is to be observed, that all this occurs

* John xiv. 26. † Acts i. 4, 5. ‡ Acts ii. § Acts vi.

before the New Testament was written, and before the Christian Church had any organization, except in its ministry. The ministry had its mission and its commission from Christ, before the Church had any organic form whatever.

Here was the Church of Christ: a kingdom on earth; a *visible* kingdom among men; for here was the WORD: the written Word of the Old Testament, and the unwritten Word of the New Testament. Here were the Sacraments, and here was the Ministry. This was the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and nothing else was. None mistook it; none could mistake it. The believers readily recognized it, and entered it; and the enemies of God had no difficulty in finding it, that they might persecute it. Here was a Christian ministry with their commissions fresh from God. Here was the seal of the covenant, direct from the hand of Christ. Here, then, was the line drawn by the finger of God, around the Kingdom of his Son, that marked, with living light, the boundaries which separated it from the kingdom of darkness, and from all organizations of men, for all future ages.

The hand of the Almighty wrote over "the narrow gate" of that Kingdom, in letters bright and bold enough to be read of all men, this sentence: "*Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*" * This language is sufficiently plain, and exclusive, and uncompromising, to mark the perpetual distinction between the Church and the world. That these three orders were to be continued in the Church, and were to constitute the Christian ministry for all time to come, and were to go hand in hand with the Word and the Sacraments, thereby identifying the Christian Church throughout the earth, is evident from the history of the Church, in the apostolic age.

The original number of the twelve apostles was made good by the appointment of MATTHIAS in place of Judas.† The objection that the office of an apostle was a temporary one, instituted solely for the work of laying the foundation of the Church, and was therefore confined to the twelve, is effectually silenced by the fact, that others were added to this

* John iii. 5. † Acts i.

number, and that too, before the canon of the New Testament was completed. Thus the miraculous conversion of St. Paul, and his appointment to the first order of the ministry immediately, by Christ himself, proves, conclusively, that the Order of the Apostles was not to be limited to the college of the twelve, since he was the thirteenth Apostle. BARNABAS was also set apart to the work of an Apostle, and he made the fourteenth. And although one qualification of the first Apostles was, that they should have seen the Lord Jesus Christ, and so be witnesses of His resurrection, which was of necessity confined to them as the Apostles, who were commissioned to lay the foundation of the Church, yet the power of their office, the commission which they had received from Christ, was transmissible, and so others, by receiving it, would be admitted to the rank of an Apostle. Hence St. Paul ordained Titus to the office of an Apostle, although he had never seen Christ, and was not, therefore, a witness of His resurrection, and as such, empowered him to ordain elders in

every city.* He moreover consecrated Timothy to the apostleship, and the churches in Ephesus were placed in his charge.† These Apostles, thus ordained and "sent," had the power to ordain and send forth others, clothed with the like office and ministry. Their commission included, of course, the power to ordain men to the second and third orders. All this is a matter of New Testament record. In the succeeding age, as we learn from ecclesiastical history, wherever the Gospel was preached, there was found this threefold Ministry, with the Word and the Sacraments; and the Christian Church appears in no other form.

In the New Testament, the word "Bishop," which means an "*overseer*," is applied to the second order of the ministry, interchangeably with the word, "*presbyter*." Very soon after the death of the first apostles, this title, "*Bishop*," was applied to the order of the Apostles, or the highest grade of the ministry, leaving the original title of Apostle to designate those, who were eye-witnesses of Christ's resurrection. Within

* Titus i. 5. † Note A.

ten years after the death of St. John, who died A. D. 100, the three orders of the ministry were designated BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS. Ignatius, who was a disciple of St. John, and who was made Bishop of Antioch by apostles then living, and who sealed his faith in the blood of martyrdom in less than ten years after the death of St. John, thus speaks: "Attend to the bishop, and to the presbytery, and to the deacons." *

The Church rapidly spread in *Asia*, *Africa*, and *Europe*. St. Thomas travelled as far east as India. St. Mark preached in Egypt, and founded the Church at Alexandria. St. Peter carried the Gospel to various parts of Asia, and may have visited Rome. St. Paul not only preached the Gospel in Greece, and Rome, and Spain, but it is believed that he planted the standard of the Cross in the Island of Britain. During the first three centuries, the Church grew rapidly, and continued comparatively pure. Wherever found, and by whatever people embraced, it had the Word, the Sacraments, and the threefold Ministry, with its commission, claiming

* Wakes. Ig. pp. 218, 219, 227.

to have the seal of the Apostles. By these divine credentials it was every where recognized and submitted to, as "the Church of the living God — the pillar and ground of the truth." Such were the distinctive features of this kingdom, that no one who was looking for it, could possibly mistake it; and no considerable body of men had, as yet, the presumption to put asunder what Christ had joined together.

After the conversion of the Emperor Constantine, in the fourth century, the Church began to receive the smiles of the world, and the patronage of the state, and then it began to decline in godliness.

Thus far each Church had its own bishop, and these were essentially independent of each other. The Churches in Asia, Africa, Gaul, Spain, and Britain, were on an equality, and all of them were independent of Rome. The Bishop of Rome met other bishops of the Church in councils, without having or claiming any superiority. It was not until the seventh century, that the Bishop of Rome, having stealthily assumed powers that did not belong to him, was acknowl-

edged by the Western Churches as supreme, and not even then without sharp opposition.

The papal supremacy was then, and has ever since been rejected by the Greek and Oriental Churches. Henceforth there was a great division in the Christian Church. Asia and the east of Europe, including Greece, and the north-eastern part of Africa were on the one side, and known as the GREEK CHURCH; and Europe, from Austria westward, was on the other side, and known as the LATIN CHURCH.

The Church of England was founded, probably, in the Apostolic Age, and, it is said, by the labors of St. Paul. In common with other churches it maintained its independence of the Church of Rome, for more than five centuries. It had the Word, the Sacraments, and the threefold Ministry; *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*. It derived the succession, not from the Church of *Rome*, but from the *Apostles*, through the Bishops of *Arles* and *Lyons*, and the *Asiatic Bishops*.

The British Church thus continued, until the time of the Saxon invasion. After that event, the Romish Church, in A. D. 596,

sent Augustine, with a company of Missionaries, to that Island. The efforts of these Romans were so far successful, that while the heathen Saxons were converted to Christianity, the British Church herself was gradually brought under the domination of the Romish hierarchy.

When Augustine landed, he found the queen an avowed Christian. He found, moreover, a Church fully organized, with an Archbishop and seven Bishops. As early as A. D. 400 or 420, a synod of British Christians was held at Verulam, for the purpose of checking the heresy of Pelagius. At the Council of Arles, held in A. D. 314, there were present British Bishops. At this time, there were three metropolitans in Britain, and this was two hundred years before there were any Roman missionaries on the Island. St. Alban, its proto-martyr, was put to death for his faith, during the persecution under Diocletian in A. D. 305. Almost three hundred years before Rome had a foothold in Britain, the British Church had not only her Bishops but her *martyrs*.

Thus it is evident that the Church was

fully established in England, and from a source entirely independent of Rome, nearly five hundred years before the Romish Church sent thither its emissaries.

The shades of the night of the Middle Ages were now falling upon Christendom. The Pope's supremacy had finally, though reluctantly, been conceded by the Western Churches, and the successor of St. Peter was beginning to lord it over God's heritage. To the great credit of the English Church, it can be shown, that, during this dark period, there were leading men in that communion who made a bold stand, not only against the usurpations, but against the *corruptions* of Popery. In A. D. 961, Archbishop Dunstan did not hesitate to set at defiance the papal mandate, when he deemed it unjust or improper. Alfric Pottock, Archbishop of York from 1023 to 1050, openly impugned the doctrine of transubstantiation. "In the next century, Gilbert Foliat, consecrated Bishop of Hereford in 1148, set at defiance the papal authority, and, though twice excommunicated by the Pope, paid no regard to the thunders of the Vatican." "Robert

Grostete, or Greathead, Bishop of Lincoln from 1234 to 1258, visited Rome, and protested against its corruptions before the Pope and Cardinals." He subsequently "set at naught the Pope's commands, for which he was excommunicated; but the thunderbolt fell harmless at his feet, and he died in peaceful possession of his See." * As late as the twelfth century the Irish Church refused to accede fully to the supremacy of the Pope. †

For hundreds of years "there was darkness over the promised land" of Christendom, "and gross darkness covered" both ministry and people. Idolatry, superstition, unsound doctrines, and corrupt practices, every where prevailed. Yet this was still the Church of Christ. Just as the Jewish Church was the Church of God, while in a state of idolatrous rebellion. In our Saviour's time the ministry of that Church had become exceedingly corrupt, yet He recognized them as having divine authority, and after this manner counselled His disciples: "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that ob-

* Chapin, on the Primitive Church. † Note O.

serve and do; but do not ye after their works." *

In the sixteenth century, the time, in God's good Providence, had come, when the Apostolic Church of England should arise, and, throwing off the papal yoke, again take her rightful place as a branch of the Universal Church of Christ. In doing this "she freed herself from the errors into which she had fallen."

There was no *new* Church created at the Reformation. The English Church, by the help of her divine Head, reformed herself. She did not thereby lose her *identity*, much less her Apostolic existence. "The errors of the Church were not the Church herself, and in quitting them she did not quit herself, any more than a man changes his face when he washes it, or loses his identity when he recovers from a disease. The English Church after the Reformation was as much the English Church, as Naaman was Naaman after he had washed away his leprosy in the River Jordan." During all this period of darkness and corruption, the Church of England

* Matt. xxiii. 1, 2.

did not lose her visibility nor her identity "Job was *visibly* and *verily* Job, when he was covered with sores. So was the Church in Britain visible in the darkest hour of that black midnight of ages. She was visible in her Churches, in her ordained Ministers, in the Holy Sacraments, the Holy Scriptures." She shone forth in the flames of her martyrs, who suffered for the truth.

The rule of reformation which she followed was this: to reject whatever of doctrine was unscriptural, and whatever of usages were contrary to the practice of the Church in the first and purest ages. She simply threw off what Popery had superadded to the faith. The great difference between the reformation in England and the reformation on the Continent was this: the English Church rejected nothing, simply because the Romish Church held or practised it, for the reason that this, of itself, did not make a doctrine or a ceremony wrong. Hence, she retained the ministry in the three orders, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, a liturgical service, clerical vestments, and other minor matters, none of which were the fruits of the papacy. It is

very true, Rome had abused the office of a Bishop, but that was no good reason for rejecting what the Apostles had established. So Rome had more than abused the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not only by withholding the cup from the laity, but by degrading that divine Ordinance of Christ, into an act of absolute idolatry; yet that most abominable abuse would not justify the rejection of the Sacrament altogether. There were some things which the English Church held, and still hold, in common with the Roman Church, for the good reason that these things were held by the Church in the Apostolic age. On the contrary, the Reformers on the Continent were not content to exscind simply what was *corrupt*, but in their zeal they cut off what was *Apostolic*. They rejected Episcopacy, because the Bishop of Rome was a Pope. As well might they have rejected the Bible and the Lord's Supper.

The multitude of sects, which subsequently sprang up, carried this unlicensed liberty to still greater extremes. There were the "Independents," who not only rejected Episcopacy, but Presbyterianism also, and so refused

all ministry that pretended to an Apostolic commission, and accepted such only, as the congregation should make for themselves; hence they were called "*Congregationalists*." Then there were the *Quakers*, who rejected not only the ministry, but the Sacraments.

The Puritans, who would not tolerate either the Episcopacy of England or the Presbyterianism of Geneva, and who felt aggrieved at the union of Church and State, in consequence of their sufferings as dissenters, emigrated to this country in search of that liberty which they could not enjoy at home. They had hardly placed their feet on Plymouth Rock, ere they formed a State and joined it to the Church, so that the colonial daughter, in her infancy, rivalled her venerable mother in the tenacity with which she cherished the unnatural wedlock of "Church and State." Nor was she very much behind her queenly matron in the zeal with which she maintained the supremacy of her established religion, as Quakers, Baptists, and Churchmen could feelingly attest.

The members of the Church of England

in the colonies were comparatively few. Nevertheless, several parishes were organized in New England, and in New York and Virginia. In Massachusetts, Churchmen felt the fires of persecution, which Puritan hands had lighted on the shores of the new world. Among other enactments, it was made a penal offence for any person to observe the festival of Christmas by a religious service; so that if a Churchman should sing a Psalm of Praise to God, in this city of Boston, in commemoration of the birth of Christ, he would be liable to be thrust into a dungeon.*

Episcopal clergymen were sent over from England and chiefly maintained by Missionary Societies in the English Church. The parishes here were, nominally, under the care of the Bishop of London. When the colonies declared their independence of the mother country, then there was a necessary abrogation of the ecclesiastical relations, which the Episcopal Church here sustained to the Church of England.

In the year 1784, the Rev. Samuel Sea-

* Note B

bury was elected to the office of Bishop, by the clergy of Connecticut, and was consecrated by certain Bishops in Scotland. The Rev. William White of Pennsylvania, Rev. Samuel Provost of New York, and the Rev. James Madison of Virginia, were consecrated Bishops in England; the first two in 1787, and the last named in 1790. The organization of the Episcopal Church in the United States was very soon completed. And here were the *Word*, the *Sacraments*, and the *Ministry*, in the three orders of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, in an unbroken succession, from the Apostles. This divine commission has thus come down to us from Christ. It has to-day just the same freshness and authority, that it had, when St. Paul ordained Titus with power to ordain others in like manner.

The Bishops of the American Church can trace their ecclesiastical lineage through Archbishop Sheldon, up through the old English, Italian, and Irish Episcopate, to the Apostolic Age.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States claims thus to be a branch of

"the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

The Church of Christ, all admit, is an *entity;* — it is some where, and must be known by some thing. Where is it, and what are the signs of it? I answer: It is to be found wherever the Word, the Ministry, and the Sacraments are found. However it may be with others, for whom we do not speak, we claim to have these *three*. The Church of *Christ*, which "He bought with His blood," which He has promised to be with, to the end of the world, is not just what wicked or even pious men choose to make it: — one thing in one place, and a totally different thing in another place. The Church is like its Divine Head in the essential qualities of its being: "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." There are men who reject the Bible, — they don't believe the Word of God. Are they the Church? There are others who reject the Sacraments. They recognize no covenant, and so repudiate the seal of it. Are they the Church? There are men who scout the divinity of Christ, laugh at His Miracles, and

talk of the coming of better men than He. Are they the Church? There are others who do not believe in any ministry. Are they the Church of Christ? Others pretend to have a revelation of their own, superior to the Bible — the followers of Mahommed, Swedenborg, Anne Lee, and Smith, with revelations as contradictory to each other, as they all are contradictory to the Word of God. Are they the Church of God's only Son?

Here is the latest spiritual swindle, which has turned the minds of men till they are made to believe, that a man can have a better book than the Bible, rapped out for him at his own fireside. Are these people, who "seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter," are they the Church of Christ?

Can it be that the Saviour, who knew what is in the human heart, and who foresaw in what eccentric forms man's depraved folly would develop itself, should place His Church in the world, as the *exclusive* instrumentality for the salvation of men, without any infallible marks, by which it might be distin-

guished from all things human, and all things devilish? Such an idea is preposterous. The world is as wicked, as rebellious, as curious, as inventive, as fond of change and of novelty now, as in the days of Moses and the Prophets, and as in the time of Christ and His Apostles. The marks of the Jewish Church were such, in that "wicked and adulterous generation," that nobody was in any danger of confounding that Church with any other organization. Would Christ make the marks of the *Christian* Church to be less distinct?

His Church is here, among men. It has been here more than eighteen hundred years, and it is to continue here, until the last great day. Amid the noise, and confusion, and conflict, which fill the world, as the offspring of sin, this Church is to do its great work, and there will never be an hour when it may not be identified as "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." It may be known now, and for all time to come it will be known, as it has been known for more than eighteen centuries. Wherever there "is a congregation of faith-

ful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things, that of necessity are requisite to the same," * there is "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." By whatever name it may be known, or whoever may be its members, that organization is the Church of Christ, as distinguished from all devices of men.

Do you ask how we may be sure of a ministry of "unbroken succession," from the Apostles, holding and handing down their commission from Christ? I answer, — just as you are sure that this Bible has come down to us, "a true copy" of the original manuscript, written by the inspired pen of the Apostles. This Holy Bible, and this ministerial commission, have been transmitted by the same hands. They have both been guarded by that vigilance of the Church, in all ages, which warrants the confidence that is now, and ever has been, entertained by the faithful, every where, in the authenticity of that book, which we call the Bible.†

* 19th Article. † Note C.

Is it objected, that this is an exclusive claim on the part of a comparatively small minority of Christendom? To this I answer: that for fifteen hundred years from the Apostles, there *was no other* ministry in the Christian Church. Wherever the Church existed there were these three orders: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, claiming to come from the Apostles. But it may be asked: What relation does Episcopacy bear to other forms of ministry, at the *present* time? To this question I reply, that if it were in the minority, in point of numbers, that fact could by no possibility affect its claim to Apostolic authority. The popular will in a particular locality cannot change the principles of truth. Principles are not like politicians, made and unmade by a majority of voices. There are in the world, at the present time, about *two hundred millions* of people, who bear the Christian name. Of these two hundred millions, one hundred and eighty millions acknowledge the authority of the Apostolic ministry, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. It appears then, that at the present time, about four

fifths of all Christendom retain the ministry as the Apostles established it, and as the whole Church retained it for fifteen hundred years. It may be objected, that such a view of the ministry is an acknowledgment, that the Romish and Greek communions have the Apostolic ministry, and are therefore Churches of Christ. We aver that they are Christian Churches, holding more or less of error. But their errors do not vitiate their Orders. Their abuse of the ministerial commission does not annihilate that commission. As I have already said, the Scribes and Pharisees were so corrupt, in doctrine and in life, that the Saviour likened them "to whited sepulchres full of all uncleanness," and yet, in His day, they sat in Moses' seat, and by His command His disciples were required to recognize their divine commission, while they were to be careful to avoid the contamination of their evil example. "Baalam was a wicked man, but a true Prophet." * "The Sons of Eli, bad as they were, ceased not to be Priests." †

It may be asked, if our Protestant Priest-

* Num. xxii to xxiv. ; xxxi. 16. † 1 Sam. ii.

hood is not indebted for its existence to a reformation brought about by Henry the VIII. to gratify his own evil passions? Suppose we admit all this, what then? "Henry was an agent in effecting this great work; still the work-man is not the work. The Temple of Solomon was constructed with cedars of Lebanon hewn by workmen of *heathen* Tyre. Jehu did not please God; but his reformation did. Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus were idolatrous; but their edicts for God's service were religious. The Temple, in which our Lord was presented and in which He preached, and worshipped, had been repaired by the impious and cruel Herod, who sought the Lord's life." * So in the matter of the Reformation, the character of the agency did not affect the integrity of the work itself.

There are not a few among the less enlightened of the community, who regard the Episcopal Church, whose distinctive principles I am here to explain, as but a slight remove from the Roman Catholic Church. While others, a little less bigoted, conde-

* Theop. Americanus, p. 199.

scend to confess, that while ours is something of an improvement upon the papal communion, yet we are the legitimate offspring of the "mistress of abominations," and carry the lineaments of the scarlet mother in our countenances quite too distinctly, to leave any doubt of our pedigree. In reply, we have only to say, that ours is a *Protestant* Church in the most comprehensive sense of that term. It did not originate from the papal communion. It is no offspring of Rome. As I have already shown, the English Church had an existence five hundred years, before Roman Catholic missionaries visited the Island of Great Britain. In the seventh century she was overcome by Popery; and in the sixteenth century she threw off that yoke of papal bondage, and stood, where she stood before, an Apostolic Church, with a ministry which came to her from apostolic hands, through Bishops, who were not of Rome. So much as to the taint of parentage.

In clearing herself of the corruptions of Romanism, at the Reformation, she uttered her perpetual "*Protest*" against the heresies of that church, in tones that made the Vatican

tremble. The Episcopal Church, Romish! I ask, who fought the battles of the English Reformation? From whose ranks came forth, during this eventful period, that noble army of martyrs, who went to Heaven from the plains of Smithfield, in chariots of fire? Who were the mighty men of that age of ecclesiastical revolution, whose lives and learning were consecrated to the work of exposing the unscriptural dogmas of Rome, whose strong hands were stretched forth to strip the pontifical robes from that graceless tyrant, who had so long and so effectually enslaved Christ's freemen? Who were the bold preachers of that day, the men that "took their lives in their hands," and went forth to denounce the usurpations of priestly power, and the practice of the idolatrous rites of Romanism? English Churchmen, every one of them! The Episcopal Church, Romish! I ask, the men who make this assertion, where do you borrow the weapons wherewith you assault Popery? Whose arguments do you use, whose learning do you employ, whose books do you study, when you attack the Papacy? Do not every one of

you go to the armory, which the Old English Divines have so richly furnished, for every weapon you use against Romanism? Can you bring forward a single strong Protestant argument, which is new, or which cannot be found in the writings of the champions of the Reformation in the Church of England? If all this be so, why do these zealous boasters stultify themselves, by continually ringing changes upon that well worn saw of "Popery in Episcopacy"? But more than this, I challenge any body of Christians to produce one tithe of the amount of printed standard authority for doctrines, which are *anti-papal*, as the Protestant Episcopal Church can show in her Prayer Book and Homilies. Until these accusers can do something like this, they should cease to make the charge of Romanism or Romish tendencies against our Church.

But it is said that our ministers go to Rome. Admitting that such may have been the fact in some instances, what does it prove? Does it show that ours is a school of Papacy? No more than the treason of Judas proved that the college of the Apostles

was a school of Apostasy. There are nearly twenty thousand Protestant Episcopal Clergymen in the English and American Episcopal Churches; and within the last ten years, there may have been among them one hundred defections to Rome. Take twenty thousand ministers of the other Protestant bodies in this country, if there be so many here, and see how many of this number have been displaced from the ministry, during the last ten years, for errors in doctrine and life. You will probably find two for every one that has gone to Rome, from the Episcopal Church; and do you *therefore* conclude, that these respectable denominations are necessarily tending to infidelity and immorality?

There is another view of this matter, which should be taken. We get credit for conversions to Romanism, to which we are not entitled. A very large proportion of the defections to Popery, in the Episcopal Church in the United States, both of clergy and laity, are persons who have come into our fold from the various denominations around us. Many of them are fatally infected before they

come among us. They stay long enough to break out with the loathsome disease, and then we, forsooth, get the name of having a "pest-house," and all godly people are warned to keep clear of the Church, if they wish to preserve their faith in good health. It, however, has happened, in many cases, that persons have gone direct to the Church of Rome, from the communions in which they have been reared, without taking the Episcopal Church in their way. This has been the fact in this State. The converts to Popery, in Boston, for the last ten years, have represented the Orthodox Congregationalist, the Baptist, and the Unitarian denominations.

The *protestant* character of our communion is seen in this, that when a man once becomes a *papist*, he cannot stay in it. He cannot teach its doctrines, nor use its prayers, nor enjoy its services. He is not at home. He "goes out from us because he is not of us," and like Judas, finds "his own place." We need no better witnesses of the thoroughly *protestant* character of our Church, than the testimony of *perverts* to Rome.

The Episcopal Church is *protestant* in

another sense. The world, as it stands aloof from the Kingdom of Christ, is intelligent enough to perceive, that all the errors in Christendom are not clustered about the "Seven Hills"; that there are those who have departed from the faith, who do not wear the livery of the Vatican.

The Episcopal Church assaults the faith of none. She makes no war upon the system of others. She is content with simply maintaining her own Apostolic standards, and in this unobtrusive manner, *protesting* against their multiform errors. She beholds the serried ranks of the Romans on the one hand, and the motley multitude of the conflicting sects on the other. Of these sects, none are over three hundred years old, and many of them are much younger. Some of them came into being, within the memory of persons in this congregation.

In respect to Church government, other Protestant bodies may be divided into three classes: Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational. This last includes all who adopt that mode of church government; embracing Baptists, Unitarians. Orthodox Congregation-

alists, Universalists, a part of the Methodists, Quakers, Shakers, &c.

The *Methodists* have an Episcopal form of government. Their ministry consists of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons; but their Episcopacy only reaches to John Wesley; whereas to be valid, it should reach to the Apostles. Mr. Wesley was a godly minister of the Church of England, at a time when pious preachers were not as numerous in that Church as they are now. His heart burned within him for a true revival of pure and undefiled religion, of which there was great need. God blessed his preaching. Multitudes became interested. These new converts were Church of England people, and their zealous devotion to the duties of religion procured for them the soubriquet of METHODISTS; a title first given to Mr. Wesley at the University of Oxford, by way of reproach, for his exactness of life. Mr. Wesley never intended to be the founder of a sect. He says, at a meeting of their preachers in 1744, "I exhorted them to keep to the Church; observing that this was our peculiar glory — not to form any new sect, but

abiding in our own Church, to do to all men all the good we possibly could." A strong sectarian spirit having manifested itself, and Mr. Wesley desiring to bring the matter to an issue, caused the question to be discussed, and it was finally decided, without a dissenting voice, that "It is by no means expedient that the Methodists should leave the Church of England." So strong was this feeling, that the following declaration was inserted in the first rules of their society: "*they that leave the Church, leave us.*" "And this we did," says Mr. Wesley, "*not as a point of prudence, but* a point of conscience." In 1789, two years before his death, he used these words: "I declare once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice, will ever separate from it." "In his sermon, preached at Cork, about the same time, he declared to the preachers in his connection, that they had no right to baptize and administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." His design was to improve the state of religion *in* the Church; and, as he said, he did not dare to

leave the Church. "Mr. Wesley, when he was eighty years of age, in a private chamber of a public house in Bristol, England, was induced to lay his hands upon the head of the Rev. Dr. Coke, a Presbyter of the Church of England, appointing him as a *superintendent* over the missionary operations of the Methodists in America. On Dr. Coke's arrival in this country, he proceeded to lay his hands on the head of a Mr. Asbury, a layman, and thereby ordained him to the same office of superintendent. These two men soon began to call themselves Bishops. When Mr. Wesley heard of this, he immediately rebuked their arrogation of an office and title, which he never pretended to have conveyed. In a letter to Mr. Asbury, he says: '*How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be elected a Bishop?* I shudder, I start at the very thought. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put an end to this.'"* This was the origin of Methodist Episcopacy. In the matter of the ministry, the Methodists have the "form, without the power." Mr. Wesley could not give to another what he

* Richardson's "Reasons," &c.

had never received himself. Not being a Bishop he could not confer Episcopal powers on Dr. Coke, and never intended to confer any such power.* The Episcopal Church cannot, of course, recognize an Episcopacy originating with a Presbyter of the Church of England, as Apostolic, and therefore valid.

The Presbyterians originated with John Calvin, at the Reformation.† They believe in one order of the ministry. They hold, as Episcopalians do, to the doctrine of an Apostolic succession, with this difference; we adhere to the three Orders, as they have come down from the Apostles; they hold to the parity of the ministry, of which there is no historical proof, over three hundred years old.

"The origin of the Congregationalists is commonly ascribed to Robert Brown, who organized a church in England in 1583, who were called Brownists." There may have been some Churches formed upon Congregational principles a few years earlier, in the reign of Edward the VI. and Queen Mary. Brown's church, however, seems to have

* Note D. † Note E.

come to nought. About the beginning of the 17th century, *John Robinson* appeared, who has been called the father of Modern Congregationalism. He gathered a congregation in England, went to Holland, and thence a portion of his people emigrated to America in 1620. They rejected the doctrine of an Apostolical succession of the ministry. They regarded the congregation as having all power, in the matter of conferring the ministerial commission. Hence, the congregation having chosen one of their number a minister, had a right to ordain him, and having ordained him he was thereby made a minister of Christ. The Episcopal Church holds to the principle, that no man can give to another, a power that he does not himself possess; that a congregation of men cannot make ministers of God, any more than they can make Sacraments. A stream can never run higher than the fountain from which it proceeds. Christ called and sent His Apostles with power to send others. This was before the Church had any organic form. He did not organize a congregation and give them power to com-

mission His ministers. On the other hand the ministers, with their commissions from Christ, gathered and organized the believers into congregations and Churches.*

The first Baptist Church of which there is any record, was organized in March, 1639, by Roger Williams, in Rhode Island. Mr. Williams was a minister of the Church of England. Mr. Ezekiel Holliman, a layman, immersed Mr. Williams, and Mr. Williams in turn immersed Mr. Holliman. This denomination hold that by baptism, a person is admitted into the Church of Christ, and that *immersion* is the only mode of baptism. Hence, all who have not been immersed are *unbaptized*. Mr. Holliman was not only not a minister, but he was not a *member* of the Church, and so this layman, himself *unbaptized*, administers baptism to Mr. Williams. With such a baptism, Mr. Williams proceeds to baptize as a minister. And then and there commenced the Baptist Church. The first association of Baptists was held in London in 1689.† In respect to a body of Christians who reject infants from the cov-

* Note F. † Note G.

enant, — who restrict the administration of baptism to one mode, — whose baptism is to be traced to a layman, — whose ministerial commission came from the congregation, and that only a little more than two hundred years ago, the Episcopal Church must be *Protestant*.

To the Unitarians, who are still younger, — who have neither the Apostolic Ministry nor the Apostolic faith, — the Quakers, who have neither the Ministry nor the Sacraments, — the Shakers, and the multitude of sects whose peculiarities I cannot describe, — to all these the Episcopal Church is simply PROTESTANT. By quietly but firmly adhering to the "faith once delivered to the Saints," — by holding to the Ministry as the Apostles ordained and transmitted it, she bears her faithful testimony against every form of error, whether it spring from *Rome* or *Geneva*, *England* or *America*.

II. I now propose to notice very briefly the *doctrines* of the Church.

1. The teaching of the Church on the subject of *human depravity*.

The doctrines of the Church are set forth in her Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies.

In these she teaches that "all men are conceived and born in sin," * and "there is no health in us." † "Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil." ‡

Such is the Church's teaching of the natural sinfulness of man.

2. What is her belief in the nature and necessity of a *change of heart?* In one of her Articles, and almost every where in her offices, she teaches and inculcates, as a fundamental doctrine of Scripture, man's utter inability to do any thing good, without God's "special grace, which he must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer." The language of Article X. is: "The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore we

* Baptismal Service. † Gen. Con. ‡ Art. IX.

have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will." Morning and evening her ministers pray: "O God, make clean our hearts within us." In the collect for Ash Wednesday occurs this petition: "Create and make in us new and contrite hearts."

3. The doctrine of the *Divinity of Christ* is interwoven with every part of the Prayer Book. The beams of the Sun of Righteousness shine forth from every page of the Liturgy. The Divinity of the Son of God is, as it were, crystallized in the Liturgy. The Church every where holds up Christ, in His divine nature, as the corner stone of all she has, or does, or hopes for, in the work of salvation. In the fact of His death she recognizes the great atoning sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. In the all-sufficiency of that atonement, she trusts and thus expresses her belief in the language of Article XXXI.: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satis-

faction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

4. The doctrine of the Trinity is held and taught as one of the first principles of the Gospel, and is fully set forth in the Liturgy and Articles.

5. Touching the doctrine of justification by faith, nothing can be more explicit than the language of Article XI.: "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

It is the less necessary to elaborate a scriptural argument to prove, that these cardinal doctrines are a part of the "faith once delivered to the Saints," inasmuch as we hold them in common, with what are termed the Orthodox or Evangelical bodies of Protestant Christians around us.

The Church, in Article XXVII., sets forth the duty of bringing children to baptism in these words: "The baptism of young chil-

dren is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

Infant baptism was practised universally throughout Christendom, until the seventeenth century, and is in accordance with the practice of nineteen twentieths of all Christendom at the present day.

When God first established His Church on earth, He decided, for reasons which it does not become us to question, that His Church should be composed of *adults* and *infants*. By His explicit command little children, at the age of eight days, were to be made members of the Church, by receiving the seal of the Covenant. When Christ was an infant, He too was circumcised. When He entered upon His ministry, He changed the *seal*, but He did not change the covenant or the subjects of it. All the time He was on the earth infants were circumcised. The rite was held most dear by His own people, the Jews, and of it they were jealous, as of a privilege of inestimable value. They charged Christ with many things, and sought by every expedient in their power, to bring reproach

upon Him, and dishonor upon His cause. They endeavored on every occasion, to stir up the people against Him, and yet, strange to say, they never charged Him with depriving them of the privilege of placing their children within the covenant. Very many things in the Mosaic Church were to be abrogated. Christ did not leave either His friends or His enemies in any doubt, as to what He taught. If there was to be a change so fundamental as this — one which touched a tender spot in the heart of every child of Abraham — one that was so completely to revolutionize the mode of membership — how can we account for the Saviour's silence? We are sometimes tauntingly challenged to produce a single instance of infant baptism, in the New Testament, as if the want of such a record was an unanswerable argument in proof, that the practice is unscriptural. That very silence is one of the strongest arguments in favor of infant baptism. If children had been admitted to the Church from the time of Abraham, a period of more than eighteen hundred years, and they were to continue to be members of the covenant, through all

time to come, why should any thing be said about it, what occasion would there be to speak of it? If, on the other hand, this custom of eighteen hundred years was to be abrogated, and children were no longer to be members of the Church, then we should look for some explicit mention of such change.

In the second century we find this custom prevailing every where throughout the Christian Church; nobody objecting to it as an innovation, or as a new doctrine, which the Apostles did not teach. If it had not the sanction of Christ and His Apostles, how could it have been thus early introduced universally, in the Church, with no record of a single objection from any quarter, in an age, when men were living, who had conversed with those who had seen the Apostles, and this, too, in the purest period of the Church, when the least indication of error in doctrine was promptly met and promptly denounced? While the date of the introduction of every heresy in the Christian Church can be readily pointed out, the most learned opponent of infant baptism has never yet been able to adduce a particle of credible

historical testimony, which tells the time and the place where this practice took its rise.*

To say that an unconscious child is not a fit subject for membership in the Church of the living God, is to accuse the Almighty of folly. Let it be remembered, that the idea of infant membership of the Church was not a suggestion of Abraham, but a *command* of Jehovah. It is sometimes objected, that Christ came to bring the Mosaic dispensation to an end, with all that pertained to it. If this were so, the chain of the argument is not long enough to reach *Infant* Baptism, for the Church membership of infants was not a *Mosaic*, but a *Patriarchal* institution.

As to the *mode* of baptism, the Church considers that the application of water to the person, by the minister, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is valid baptism, whether it be by aspersion or by immersion. Sacraments are essentially symbols, and it is plain that the significance of a symbol cannot depend upon the quantity of the matter employed. There must be *water* in the sacrament of baptism, as there must be bread

* Note H.

and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To the communicant who receives the consecrated symbols in faith, a crumb of bread and a drop of wine are to him, as essentially a sacrament, as a loaf of bread and cup of wine could possibly be. Moreover, the word *baptize*, whatever it may mean when used by heathen classics, does not mean exclusively *immersion* as used in Holy Scripture. If we would know the definition of this term as employed in the Gospel, we are not to go to the dictionaries for its signification, but to the BIBLE.

There is no passage in the Old or New Testament, where it can be shown that this word means immersion. The most that can be said is, that in certain texts immersion is possible, and perhaps probable. On the other hand, there are texts in which the word occurs, where it not only does not, but *cannot* mean *immersion*. Thus we are told that the Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.* And yet the Israelites were on "dry land," and "under the cloud." There is, then, a baptism which a

* 1 Cor. x. 2; Exod. xiv. 16–22.

person may receive, while standing on *dry land*. Such a baptism cannot, by any possibility, be immersion.

Again; Christ promised that His disciples should be baptized with the Holy Ghost.* Thus the Saviour explicitly declared, that when the Apostles should receive the Holy Spirit it would be a *baptism*. On the day of Pentecost, they received the fulfilment of this promise. In what way? Let St. Peter answer: "This is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass, in the last days, (saith God,) I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."† We have here the declaration of a prophet, that the Holy Spirit would be "*poured out*." We have the declaration of the Saviour, that the Holy Spirit would be given to His Apostles, and when given, it would be a *baptism*. We have the testimony of St. Peter, that the promise of Christ, and the prophecy of Joel, were both fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; and so we have here, on an authority that cannot be gainsaid, a definition of the word baptism, viz.: "*pouring*," and

* Acts i. 5. † Acts ii. 16, 17.

thus baptism and pouring are one and the same thing.

Again, we are told by St. Mark that "the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not." "And when they come from the market, except they baptize (*Βαπτίσωνται*), they eat not." In our English version it is translated *wash*. Here the application of a small quantity of water to a small portion of the body is called a *baptism*. No one will pretend, that every time a Jew went home from the market, he plunged into the water all over. We learn the custom from the context: "Except they wash (*νίψωνται*) their hands oft, they eat not." Says St. Mark: "Many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the baptism (*Βαπτισμοὺς*) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables." * In our version it is rendered *washings*. These baptisms were purifications from legal or ceremonial uncleanness. Does any body suppose, that every time a table or a couch was defiled by the merest touch of something legally unclean, that it was immersed

* Mark vii. 3, 4.

in water? The thing would be utterly impracticable. Besides, there is no evidence whatever, that the Jews ever did any such thing. If you would know what these baptisms were, and how they were performed, you have only to turn to the Book of Numbers,* where the whole ceremony is described, which consists in sprinkling water upon the furniture to be cleansed, with a bunch of hyssop. For this purpose families were supplied with "water-pots of stone, containing two or three firkins apiece." †

The word *baptize* has a generic meaning, similar to our English word *travel*. A person is said to travel when he walks, when he rides upon a horse, when he sails in a ship. A person is baptized when he is immersed, when he is sprinkled, and when water is poured upon him. The ministers of the Episcopal Church baptize by immersion, when that mode is required by those who are to receive it. The almost universal practice is, however, by aspersion. To hold to immersion as the only mode of baptism, would involve ministers in a serious di-

* Num. xix. 18. † John ii. 6.

lemma. The command of Christ is to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, and baptize them." There is no exception made in favor of any class whatever. If immersion be the only mode, then a person, who is on a dying bed, cannot be baptized. If he have an acute disease in his *body*, his *soul* cannot be admitted into covenant with God, and cannot therefore have the benefit, that pertains to a covenant relation to God. What is disease but a fruit of the fall? In this case the effect of sin in a perishing *body* is made an effectual barrier against the admission of the *soul* into the kingdom of God; for Christ has said, —"Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." * Can we suppose that the Saviour would institute any such mode of admission into his spiritual kingdom, as could be enjoyed only, by those who were favored with good bodily health? What has the condition of a man's *mortal body* to do with the salvation of his *immortal spirit?* Baptism is the seal of the covenant, and may be applied to

* John iii. 5.

every creature, whatever the condition of his body. Christ's spiritual kingdom is brought into no such relationship to the infirmities of human life, and the salvation of the soul is put into no such condition of dependence, upon the health of the body.

I have thus far considered those distinctive *principles* of the Church, which are necessary to its existence: the Word, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. I now proceed to consider the distinctive features of our Church, which, though important, are not absolutely essential, and may be modified.*

Leaving the Doctrines of the Church, we pass to a brief notice of its WORSHIP.

III. The public services of the sanctuary are conducted according to a prescribed form.

What, it may be asked, is the *authority* and what is the *utility* of a Liturgy? I hardly need remark, that forms of prayer are no new thing. If you ask me where they originated, I answer, in *Heaven*. The very first suggestion of a precomposed form

* Preface to the Prayer Book.

of divine service, came from God himself. Liturgies, are, therefore, no *human* invention.

When the Tabernacle had been erected, and the people gathered into it, God gave to Moses a form of words, wherewith he should bless the people when they departed, saying: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee," &c.* When an Israelite brought to the priest "the first fruits," he was required to repeat a certain form of words. Just before the death of Moses, God commanded him to write a song commemorative of God's mercies, which the Israelites and their descendants were required to use. In the time of Christ, the Jews had a Liturgy, in their synagogues. In this service he himself joined. He rebuked the Jews for many things, but never for using a Liturgy. He censured them for *formality*, but never for employing forms of prayer. He reproved the Pharisees for their pride, and formality, and long "prayers, which they made, standing at the corners of the streets, to be seen of men." These prayers were made to attract the public attention, and so to win the

* Num vi. 22–26.

praise of passers-by, and, therefore, may have been extemporaneous.

The Jews had never been accustomed to any other than a *Liturgical* form of worship. When John the Baptist appeared, who was the appointed forerunner of Christ, and whose ministry was not, therefore, of the Jewish economy, while the Christian Church was not yet established, he very naturally prepared a service suited to his peculiar mission. He gave to his disciples a form of prayer.

When Christ entered upon His ministry, He continued to attend upon the Temple and Synagogue service, and sometimes took part in that service.* When His disciples came to him, with the request that He would furnish them with a *form of prayer*, as John had done for his disciples, He did not reply to this request that John did that, which was indeed allowed in the Jewish service, but was not to be permitted in the more spiritual worship of the Christian Church. So far from this, He immediately framed a form of prayer, gave it to His disciples, and told them to use it. It is not a little re-

* Luke iv. 16, 20.

markable, that this form is taken mainly from the Jewish Liturgy.* It is sometimes objected by those who are not accustomed to a Liturgical service, that prayers in a particular form of words cannot come from the heart. When our Saviour was in the garden, on the night of His betrayal, He prayed in the midst of the agonies of that awful hour. Think you the prayer He offered to His Father, did not come from His heart? Yet He used a *form!* He prayed three times, using a form of words.† Again, when hanging on the cross He prayed. Did ever mortal man doubt, that the prayer upon the cross came from the heart of that crucified Saviour? And yet that prayer was a form, in these words: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me;" a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm. The last sentence that fell from His lips, ere He gave up the ghost, was taken from the thirty-first Psalm: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." Thus the Saviour of the world died with a form of prayer upon His lips.

The Apostles, like their divine Master,

* Note I. † Matt. xxvi. 36, 44.

were accustomed to the Liturgical worship of the Jews ; — they, with Him, attended the Temple and the Synagogue service. Such was the strength of their attachment to a Liturgy, and so firm the habit of using a form, that on the occasion of the liberation of St. Peter from prison, when their hearts were overflowing with joy, and when, if ever, they would spontaneously express their gratitude in an extemporaneous thanksgiving, they employed a *form*, " they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said," &c. This form has been recorded by St. Luke. It is chiefly from a Psalm of David.* We are not then surprised to find the Churches which they planted, employing forms of prayer in their worship.

For fifteen hundred years, Liturgies were every where used in the Church of Christ. The Christian world was pleasantly surprised some years ago, by the announcement that the celebrated traveller, Dr. Buchanan, had discovered a church of Syrian Christians who had, for hundreds of years, remained in concealment from the Christian world, in the

* Acts iv. 23, 30.

mountain fastnesses on the coast of Malabar. They had the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and they had also a *Liturgical* form of worship. Their tradition is, that St. Thomas visited their country and founded their church. They have thus been preserved by the great Head of the Church, and after the lapse of so many ages, come forward in this nineteenth century, to bear their testimony to Apostolic doctrines and usages.

At the Reformation, the English Church retained a prescribed form of worship. From that Church we received the Book of Common Prayer, which, with a few unimportant alterations, is now used in the Protestant Episcopal Church.* The spiritual excellency of the service, and the divine authority for forms of prayer, have taught us to heed the injunction of the *Apostle*, to "*hold fast the form of sound words.*"

Many of the Protestant Communions, who have not the Apostolic Ministry, yet retain forms of prayer. It may be safely said, that about nineteen-twentienths of all Christendom have some kind of a Liturgy.

* Note K.

We see then, that extemporaneous modes of worship are, comparatively, a *novelty*, and are practised by only a very small fraction of Christendom.

The difference between our mode of worship and that of those denominations of Christians around us, who repudiate a Liturgy, is not, as it is sometimes stated, a question whether divine service should be conducted with a form of prayer, or without a form of prayer. All use a *form*. There is no such thing as a formless mode of worship. They who pretend to discard every appearance of form, are sometimes the most formal. Thus the Quakers are rigidly formal in their worship.

When a minister rises in the pulpit, to conduct the services of public worship, he says, and that very properly: "*Let us pray.*" What does he mean? Simply this: he asks the congregation to unite with him in prayer to Almighty God. He does not say, let *me* pray; but let *us* pray, — you and me. Yet, he is the only person who prays aloud. How then are the people to do as he has asked them to do? They are to

pray by *uniting* with him; i. e., he frames a petition, speaks it aloud, and so hands it over to them, and they take it, and unite with him in offering it to God, as *their* petition. He makes the *form*, and they use it. The difference then between such and ourselves is this: that inasmuch as we *must* have a *form* of prayer, they prefer to trust to their minister to make it for them on the occasion, without knowing what it is to be; and we prefer to have one already made, which we know all about; so that we may pray "with the spirit, and with the understanding also." The Church proceeds, in matters of public worship, on the principle, that the house of God is the "*house of prayer:*" that the great business of the Lord's people on the Lord's day, is to "worship Him in the beauty of holiness." The people cannot commission any one else to do this for them. There are no proxies in the duties of religion. We cannot delegate to another a duty which God requires of us. Our form of worship is framed upon the principle, that there are to be no *spectators* in the congregation of God's people. All

sorts and conditions of men are there for a purpose, and that purpose is the worship of God. One, as much as another, is required to acknowledge his sinfulness, — invoke the divine forgiveness, — praise God for His blessings, and ask for His future grace and guidance. All then, young and old, should join in the services of the Sanctuary. Some good people seem to entertain the idea, that prayer, in order to be prayer, *must be extemporaneous;* that only such prayers come from the heart. They forget, that while all true prayer does come and must come from the heart, i. e., it is and must be the sincere language of the soul, yet *words*, whether extemporaneous or written, do not come from the *heart* but from the *head.* What God requires, and what the necessities of our being demand is, that the words we use, (and which serve only as the vehicle of our petitions,) should be such as properly and reverently express our sincere desires to God. Prayers are not *orations.* They are not addressed to men, but to God. They are not designed to produce an effect on earth, but in heaven. God is not particularly pleased

with a variety. "He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

Some persons fancy that they should tire of the use of the same modes of expression, Sunday after Sunday. The proper answer to such is: you, yourselves, do not tire of the use of the same modes of expression, Sunday after Sunday, where you now are. If the extemporaneous prayers of the most gifted minister, were to be written down, as he offers them, on every occasion of public worship, for the space of a year, it would be found that there is but a very little variety in the devotional exercises of his pulpit. Again, if some of our beloved brethren in other societies, were as familiar with the Prayer Book, as they might be, they would know to what source they are sometimes indebted, for some of the choicest passages in the extemporaneous prayers of their Pastors.

Man is so constituted that he cannot serve two masters at the same time, either in his inner or in his outer life. A deep exercise of devotion and an active exercise of the mind cannot well be carried on, in the same

soul at one and the same time. If the mind of a minister is in a deep study as to what he shall say and *how* he shall say it, there cannot be a very lively exercise of the spirit of pure devotion in his heart, while he is thus engaged in searching after thoughts and suitable language, in which to clothe them. But what is the condition of the hearers in the mean time? Their minds are also exercised, because they must be on the alert, since they know not what is coming. And when the words come, it may be that they are not all of them suitable, or are not grammatically expressed, or come after much stammering and hesitation, or they are in the form of petitions for things, which the worshipper does not want. The involuntary response of his mind is: "I do not agree to that." Now amid this various mental activity what has become of the spirit of devotion, the earnest feeling of supplication, — the real soul of all prayer? It is well nigh strangled in this unhappy conflict of thought. Let us for a moment see how these objections, to an extemporaneous mode of worship are obviated, in the use of

the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church. When the worshipper enters the Church, he feels that he is entering the House of God. There is to him a sanctity pertaining to it, which does not attach to any other place, since, when once consecrated to the worship of God, it is "separated from all unhallowed, worldly, and common uses." * He takes off his hat when he enters the door, and he does not put it on until he passes out of the door. He does not do in the house of God, what would be deemed disrespectful in the house of his neighbor. On taking his seat, he bows his head and silently invokes God's blessing. Very soon the Minister appears, clad in his clerical robes. But some of my hearers may say, pray tell us, what is the authority and utility of clerical vestments? I am happy to answer, for I am here for the purpose of explanation. As to the *authority*, I have only to say, that God has once, in the Mosaic dispensation, expressed His pleasure in this regard, and He has never annulled that expression of His will. It was in His view

* Office of Consecration.

fitting, that His ministers should wear a vestment, when officiating at His altar, which they did not wear on any other occasion. The long custom of the Christian Church has sanctioned the use of clerical robes. Although we have no positive law on the subject, yet it is proper that a minister in the House of God, should appear in a habit, which is peculiar to the services of the Sanctuary, and being worn on no other occasions, is identified with the ministerial office. Again: it serves to remove from the minds of the congregation, all occasion for the indulgence of idle and wandering thoughts. It matters not who is to officiate, whether their own Rector or a stranger; there is no temptation to curious speculation as to his appearance, whether well or ill clad, in fashion or out of fashion. All frivolous distinctions of this sort, which serve to distract the attention of the congregation are effectually and happily concealed. In this respect all ministers are placed on an equality.* The

* A person once asked the late venerable and beloved Bishop Griswold, why our ministers wore the surplice? The wise old Bishop answered, "To conceal the ever-changing fashions of man."

mind of the worshipper is at once put to rest, as to the mode of the service, whoever may be the officiating clergyman. His spirit of devotion is exposed to no serious disturbance, as to the matter of the prayers or the manner of conducting the services. The worshipper has nothing to do, but to pour out his heart as best he can in prayer and praise, and devoutly listen to the teachings of the Word of God.

It is sometimes objected that there are many and unmeaning changes of position in our service. It is very true, there are in our mode of worship frequent changes of position. When we pray we *kneel;* when we praise we *stand;* when we listen to the Word we *sit*. Our position is made to conform to the nature of the particular service in which we are engaged. These frequent changes, so far from being objectionable, are, physically considered, a relief, since they serve to prevent the fatigue which necessarily attends a long continuance in one position.

As all persons have not a voice to sing, and yet all persons ought to join audibly in some form of praise, the Church provides

that a portion of the Psalms of David shall be read responsively, by minister and people, morning and evening. A lesson from the Old Testament and one from the New are also read both morning and evening. In addition to these some part of one of the Epistles and a portion of one of the Gospels, together with the Ten Commandments, are read in the morning. There is no service in any part of Christendom, where provision is made for the daily reading of so much Holy Scripture as in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. At every service we are required to repeat the articles of our belief, in the form of a creed. The Church has a CREED, because she is the Church. There can be no such thing as a Christian Church without a Christian Creed. There are some persons, I am aware, who affect to have no creed. But Christ has effectually settled the practicability of such a theological anomaly. Nobody can go to heaven without a creed. Creed is belief. Christ has said, "*He that* BELIEVETH NOT *shall be damned.*"

The services of the Church are so arranged

that every prominent event in the Saviour's life, every cardinal doctrine of the Gospel, are regularly brought to the attention of the congregation throughout the year, so that, if the people are not thoroughly instructed in every part of the Gospel system of salvation, it is their own fault. The Church is too good a mother to her children, to intrust so vital a matter to the faithfulness of her individual ministers. A minister may be false to his charge — he may swerve from the faith; but however unsound he may be in the pulpit, he is compelled to be *Orthodox* in the reading desk; and when the Desk and the Pulpit begin to contradict each other, the people will soon discover that something is out of joint, and will take measures to have the unsound member reduced or cut off.

"The Church of Christ is the ground and pillar of the truth;" as such, it is, and ever is to be, the great Conservator of the Truth.

It is the divinely ordained Guardian of the "Faith once delivered to the Saints." The most effectual instrumentality of doing this office is by means of a Liturgy. It is,

under God, the great safeguard of the people. The devil never shows his marvellous skill more effectually, than when he seeks to undermine the faith of Christians. He rarely, if ever, begins with the laity. He would make but slow headway if he did; for if he succeeded in making an apostate, he would only count one. But if he can poison the mind of a minister, and make a heretic of him, he has seized hold of the long end of a lever, with which he may tip a whole congregation out of the Ark of Salvation. A minister who is not tied to a Liturgy will do as much mischief in *praying* heresy, as he will in *preaching* it. By skilfully conforming his prayers to his preaching, he conceals the change until it has become so great, that it can no longer be disguised, and then it is too late to avert the consequences.*

The propriety and necessity of a Liturgy have been acknowledged by distinguished non-Episcopal divines. The Presbyterians, in the time of Cromwell, undertook to conduct public worship after an extemporaneous manner; they soon changed their mind, and

* Note L.

adopted a form of prayer. The Presbyterians of Scotland at the Reformation used a liturgy. Richard Baxter prepared a liturgy, and sought to have it introduced into public use. John Wesley set forth a liturgy for the use of the Methodists in this country. John Calvin, at Geneva, composed a liturgy for the Sunday service.

Of the excellence of the English Prayer Book, of which our own is almost an exact copy, Dr. Adam Clarke, the distinguished Methodist, thus speaks: "It is the greatest effort of the Reformation, next to the translation of the Scriptures into the English language. . . . . As a form of devotion it has no equal in any part of the Universal Church of God. . . . . Next to the Bible, it is the Book of my understanding, and of my heart." Robert Hall, the eloquent English Baptist, thus speaks of it: "I believe that the evangelical purity of its sentiments, the chastened fervor of its devotions, and the majestic simplicity of its language, have combined to place it in the very first rank of uninspired compositions." Dr. Doddridge, the eminent commentator, who was a Congregationalist,

thus speaks of it: "The language is so plain as to be level to the capacity of the meanest, and yet the sense is so noble as to raise the capacities of the greatest." These are the voluntary testimonies of a *Methodist*, *Baptist*, and *Congregationalist*, of whom the least that can be said is, that they were the 'first among their equals.'

We come now to the consideration of the last of the distinctive principles of the Episcopal Church, which is its POLITY.

IV. The government of the Church is *Episcopal* because its chief ministers are Bishops, and not because it is chiefly governed by Bishops. The Bishops in our Church have but little ecclesiastical power. Their duty is to ordain Deacons, and in conjunction with the Presbytery, to admit Deacons to the Priesthood — ordain Bishops, — to consecrate Churches, — preside at conventions, and to perform the Apostolic rite of Confirmation, or the laying of hands on baptized persons, who desire to take upon themselves their baptismal vows, and thereby make a profession of their faith before the world.

This custom, commenced by the Apostles, has been continued in the Church from that day to this.*

The government of the Church is purely republican. It is strikingly analogous to that of the Municipal, State, and General Government, in this country. I cannot better describe it, than by giving a brief outline of its practical operation. A number of laymen meet together and organize a parish, by the choice of two Wardens and a Board of Vestrymen. To them is committed the management of all the temporal affairs of the parish. The members of the parish choose their own minister. Once a year, on Easter Monday, parish meetings are held for the choice of Wardens and Vestrymen, who answer to the Board of Selectmen or Town Council, and for the election of delegates to the Diocesan Conventions. These lay delegates, with the ministers of the several parishes, meet annually in Convention. The Bishop presides, but has no other voice than that of a presiding officer. The clergy and laity assemble together, but form, in fact,

* Note M.

two distinct houses; and when it is so required by any delegation, they must vote separately. In such a case there must be a concurrence of both Orders, the clerical and the lay. Thus the laity represent the House of Representatives in our State Legislature, — the clergy, the Senate, and the Bishop, the Governor. This Diocesan Convention appoint a Standing Committee, consisting of three laymen and three clergymen, who are a Council of Advice to the Bishop. The Bishop has no right to ordain a Deacon or a Priest until the consent and recommendation of this Committee is first obtained. This Committee answers to the *Governor's Council.* The State, or Diocesan Convention, choose four clergymen and four laymen to represent the Diocese, or State, in the General Convention. This General Convention meets once in three years, and consists of like delegations, from every diocese in the Union, where the Church has an organization. The Bishops of the Church meet by themselves, and answer to the Senate of the United States. The clerical and lay deputies meet together and organize, by choosing

one of their number as President. Both laity and clergy commonly vote together; but if the delegation of any diocese require it, the vote must be taken by orders, i. e., the clergy and laity voting separately, there must be a concurrence of both orders, or the vote is not carried. A measure must have the concurrence of the House of Bishops, before it can become a law. The influence of the *laity* in the legislation of the Church may be seen by this illustration. If a measure should pass the House of Bishops by a unanimous vote, and coming to the lower house, should receive the vote of every clergyman, and then should be lost by one majority on the part of the laity, it could not become a law. Such is the organization of our National Ecclesiastical Congress, which commonly embraces many of the ablest men in the Church.

Our polity secures healthful discipline. Every clergyman must belong to some Episcopal jurisdiction. There can be no such thing as an Episcopal clergyman at large. If a stranger present himself to me as a clergyman of the Church, the first question

is: Where do you belong? He cannot call himself a cosmopolite,—as belonging every where, and having a home nowhere. He must have a canonical, if not a "local habitation." If he answer: Kansas, Texas, Oregon, or California, I have only to turn to the list of the clergy in that diocese and ascertain the fact.

Our parishes *choose* their own ministers; but they do not *make* them, and they cannot *unmake* them; nor can they retain them after the Church has suspended or degraded them. If a clergyman commits a crime, for which he should be displaced from the Ministry, he is tried by an Ecclesiastical Court, and if found guilty and sentenced to be degraded, that sentence is passed upon him, and he is at once put out of the Ministry; and this fact is forthwith communicated to every diocese in the United States. He cannot henceforth officiate any where as an Episcopal clergyman, nor is there any canonical provision for his future restoration to the Ministry. It matters not how influential his parish. They may love him so well as to wink at his crime; they may be more

than willing to forgive; they may seek to cover up his iniquity, and strive to whitewash the stain of his criminality, but the Church stretches out the hand of her discipline, and takes him from these fond admirers, and puts him upon his trial by a court composed of his peers. He has committed an offence against the Church, against the cause of Christ, to the scandal of true religion; and the Church is bound to protect that religion, by purging herself of a corrupt member.* His parish is as impotent as is the family of a man, who has committed a high crime and has been arrested by the civil authority. What a contrast between such a discipline and that which obtains in other systems, where a congregation have only to throw their arms around their minister, however corrupt, and he maintains his position as their preacher, to the great reproach of religion. Or should he be tried and found guilty, and sentenced to degradation from the ministry, there is no power to execute it; and he may, if he please, go back to his former congregation, if they will

Note N.

have him, or gather a new one, perhaps in the midst of the scene of his iniquity.

Such are some of the distinctive principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as seen in its Ministry, Doctrines, Worship, and Polity. I am glad to say, that some of the distinctive *features* of the Episcopal Church are becoming less distinctive. The *features* themselves remain in all their fulness, but they are becoming less and less *distinctive*, in consequence of the happy and very promising changes, which are going on in other religious bodies around us. The time was, when an educated Ministry, Gothic church edifices, the use of organs, chanting in public service, the word Church as signifying a place of worship, the term "going to church," observing the festival of Christmas, the decoration of churches with evergreens at that festive season, using a Liturgy, wearing clerical vestments, were *distinctive* features of the Episcopal Church, but they are so no longer. Once, special pains were taken, in the erection of a place of worship to have square windows, in two rows like a dwelling house, — to secure the

severest simplicity in the architecture. These places of worship were called "meeting-houses," and attendance at divine worship was termed "*going to meeting*." It would be regarded as an insult, hardly pardonable, to apply these terms at the present day. Once, it was considered a sin to have instrumental music in the Sanctuary, while there is now scarcely a place of worship, in city or town, that has not an organ. And it is by no means uncommon to hear the Church chants beautifully sung, in the congregations of the various religious bodies.

If a stranger were to conclude that every fine Gothic edifice he saw nowadays, was an Episcopal Church, he would make a great mistake.

The denominations, who in former days inveighed most strongly against an educated Ministry, have now more colleges than the Episcopal Church. The gown is becoming a very common clerical vestment. As to crosses, if we were to place gilt crosses upon our Churches, as some of our Congregational brethren are doing, in this good old Puritan State of Massachusetts, we should no doubt

be called Puseyites. But crosses will not harm them; they never harmed us, though their appearance has caused much alarm in times past.

The recent introduction of Liturgies into public worship, among several denominations, is one of the most significant signs of an inclination to return to primitive usage.

There is one other pleasing and promising evidence of progress in the right direction. It is the fact, that so large a proportion of our clergy are from the various denominations. The late Bishop Griswold stated in 1841, that of two hundred and eighty-five clergymen ordained by him, two hundred and seven of them, came into the ministry of the Episcopal Church, from other denominations. There are at the present time upwards of eighteen hundred clergymen in the Episcopal Church, about twelve hundred of whom, it is estimated, came into the Church from other folds. May the change continue to go on, until not only the *features* but the *principles* of the Church shall be less and less *distinctive;* — until there "shall be but one fold and one Shepherd."

With a ministry so Apostolic, with a Liturgy so evangelical, with a Polity so purely republican, do you wonder, that I am a Churchman, and never can be any thing else? Do you not wonder that you yourselves are not?

But let us never lose sight of the important fact, that the Church, and Ministry, and Worship, are not an *end*, but a *means*. The end is the salvation of the soul, and the glory of God. The conditions of that salvation are, repentance of sin and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. May God graciously grant us His Holy Spirit, that we may all so comply with these conditions, that through the merits of Christ's righteousness, we may find a place at His right hand, in His Kingdom above, to go no more out forever. AMEN.

NOTES.

A. (Page 18.)

"Timothy was ordained an Apostle by the laying on of the hands of St. Paul." — 2 *Tim.* i. 6.

Some allege that the passage in 1 Tim. iv. 14, refers to Timothy's ordination. "Eminent authority has declared the word 'Presbytery' to mean the *office* to which Timothy was ordained, not the *persons* who ordained him; so that the passage would read, 'with the laying on of hands to confer the presbyterate,' or presbytership, or clerical office, in which view the ordainer of Timothy was St. Paul himself, as mentioned in 2 Tim. i. 6.

"Jerome, Ambrose, and other ancients, and Calvin, interpret '*presbyterium*,' in that place, not an assembly, but the office to which Timothy was promoted. Should it be said, however, that the word 'presbyterate,' or 'presbytership,' proves Timothy to have been then ordained a presbyter merely, we would neutralize that argument by appealing to 1 Thess. ii. 6, (comp. with i. 1,) where he is called an Apostle." — *Episcopacy Tested by Scripture*, pp. 19, 20.

B. (Page 29.)

The Puritans of New England held that religious *toleration* was wrong. When they left England for America, it was not for the purpose of maintaining and enjoying the principle of toleration. This point is susceptible of abundant proof; hence their perfect consistency, though great wickedness, in hanging the *Quaker*, banishing the *Baptist*, and imprisoning the *Churchman*. Hutchinson says, "that toleration was preached against as a sin in rulers, which would bring down the judgments of Heaven upon the land." — *Hist.* I. 75.

Says Judge Story: "When Sir Richard Saltonstall

wrote to them his admirable letter, which pleads with such Catholic enthusiasm for toleration, the harsh and brief reply was: 'God forbid our love for truth should be grown so cold that we should tolerate errors.' Yes, the very men who asked from Charles the Second, after his restoration, liberty of conscience and worship for themselves, were deaf, and dumb, and blind, when it was demanded by his commissioners for Episcopalians and others." — *Story's Misc.*, p. 65.

The Puritans felt much aggrieved by the burdens laid upon them in England, for the support of the Established Church. But as soon as they have a State of their own, they not only join the Church to it, but compel *Churchmen* to pay for the support of their *Congregational* worship. The manner of enforcing the collection of this tax is illustrated by a case which occurred in the town of Stratford, Conn. "The Episcopal parish objected to paying taxes to the Congregationalists, on the ground that they were legally exempt by the law of England; and upon their refusal, Timothy Titherton, one of the church wardens, and John Marcy, one of the vestrymen, were arrested about midnight, Dec. 12, 1680, and compelled to walk eight miles to jail, where they were confined without fire or light until they paid the sums demanded." — *Chapin's Puritanism*, p. 121.

C. (Page 34.)

It has been a law of the Church, from the Apostolic Age, that the ministerial commission can only come from Christ, through the Apostles, in an unbroken succession. So important did the Church consider this to be, that she made a rule, that at every consecration of a Bishop, there should be, at least, three Bishops present and joining in the laying on of hands, so that if, in the course of time, a break should occur in any single line, (which has never yet been shown,) there are others which still hold good. The burden of proof lies upon those who, denying this Apostolic succession, assert that there has been a break, to show *where* and *when* this break took place.

It is sometimes said, that in maintaining our theory of

the ministry, we violate the Divine Law of *Charity*. This is not so. Christian Charity has nothing to do with historical *facts*. The *Apostolic Commission* is purely a matter of fact. We say, that a man must receive the ministerial commission from the Great Head of the Church, through the hands of a successor of the Apostles, whose authority to ordain ministers has come down, in unbroken succession, from the Apostles, and that this being the divine mode of constituting and perpetuating the Christian Ministry, he who has such a commission, is a lawfully ordained minister in the Church of Christ. If we believe this and consistently carry it out, without impugning the motives of those who differ from us, we surely cannot be rightfully charged with violating the Christian Law of Love.

Many persons seem to have very indistinct, if not very confused notions, as to what constitutes a Minister. They speak of certain evangelical preachers as Ministers of the Church of Christ; while there are certain other preachers, by whom they would not be baptized, and from whom they would not presume to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and whom they would not, therefore, recognize as Ministers of Christ.

Now we beg to ask such persons, how *much truth* it takes to make a MINISTER and how much *error* it takes to *unmake* him? At what point of the upward scale of orthodoxy does his Ministerial commission come into being, and *what* degree of the downward scale of heterodoxy, does it go out of being? And, moreover, who is to be the judge of this? Where is the standard? Who is to graduate that standard? If every Christian man is to do this, for himself, then it is every Christian man's prerogative, to make and unmake Ministers, at his own will and pleasure. Who is competent to go through this city, and say, according *to this rule*, this man is a Minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, and has the authority of the living God, to preach the Gospel of His Son, — and that preacher is *not* a Christian Minister, and has no authority to preach and to baptize?

There must be a definite mode of determining this question. That mode we believe to be the rule of the

Apostolic succession, which obtained every where for fifteen hundred years, — and which obtains very generally now.

D. (Page 47.)

The Methodists have a Liturgy, in the form of certain offices, which they rarely use. Their Bishops have a degree of ecclesiastical power, which more nearly approaches the power of the Bishops of the Church of Rome than that which is exercised by any Protestant body of Christians in the world. The people have no vote in the choice of their preachers. The preachers have no voice as to their locality. At the annual conferences, the Bishops assign to each minister his place for the year; and no preacher can remain in one parish more than two years consecutively. The laity have no representation in their conferences, and, therefore, no vote in ecclesiastical legislation. In no Protestant communion are the laity so completely excluded from the management of the general affairs of their church, as among the Methodists.

The evils of this feature of their polity are beginning to be felt. This feeling of dissatisfaction led to a division in 1830. The seceders organized their sect, on the principles of Congregationalism. They have thirteen hundred preachers and sixty thousand members, and are called *Protestant Methodists*. Another division took place in 1847. This division call themselves the *True Wesleyan Methodist Church*. They have about six hundred preachers and twenty thousand members.

E. (Page 47.)

John Calvin, who was the father of Presbyterianism, was not a Presbyterian from *choice*, but from what he regarded as a necessity. Here are his views of Episcopacy: "The Episcopate itself had its appointments from God. The office of a Bishop was instituted by the authority and defined by the ordinance of God."

"Let them give us such an hierarchy, in which the Bishops may so bear rule that they refuse not to submit to Christ, and to depend upon Him as their only Head: let them be so united together in a brotherly concord, as that His truth shall be their only bond of union; then, indeed, if there shall be any who will not reverence them, and pay them the most exact obedience, there is no anathema, but I confess them worthy of it." — See "*Reasons*," &c., by *Richardson*.

John Calvin not only thus sanctioned Episcopacy, but desired to be consecrated a Bishop.

Says Archbishop Abbott: "Perusing some papers of our predecessor, Matthew Parker, (Archbishop,) we find that John Calvin and others, of the Protestant churches of Germany, and elsewhere, would have had Episcopacy, if permitted, but could not upon several accounts."

It appears that Calvin sent letters, in King Edward VI.'s reign, inviting a conference with the clergy on this subject, which letters were intercepted by Gardiner and Bonner, two Romish Bishops, and they never reached their destination. Calvin received an answer purporting to be from the reformed divines, declining his overtures. In the sixth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign these letters were discovered, but Calvin was then dead.

Philip Melancthon, a Presbyterian, one of the most distinguished of the Continental Reformers, thus speaks of Episcopacy: "I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops. For I see what manner of Church we shall have, the Ecclesiastical polity being dissolved. I do see that, hereafter, there will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than there ever was before."

F. (Page 49.)

Congregational Ordination. That laymen can make a Minister of God, by putting their hands on his head, is a doctrine which may startle Congregationalists, who never were told that this is a principle of Congregationalism. So much of a *principle* did the Puritans of New England make *lay* ordination, that they even required laymen to lay their hands in ordination upon the head of a regularly ordained Minister of the Church of England, when he desired to enter their ministry — as in the case of Mr. Francis Higginson, who was ordained at Salem, July 20, 1629. Mr. H., who was a Minister in the Church of England, acting in the capacity of a layman, "with three or four more of the gravest members of the Church, laid their hands on Mr. Skelton, using prayers therewith." Then Mr. Skelton, with the same "present and assisting" peers, performed the same kind office for Mr. Higginson. And thus, says a witness of the scene: "I hope you, and the rest of God's people with you, will say that here was a right foundation laid, and that these two blessed servants of the Lord, came in at the door, and not at the window." — *Felt's Annals of Salem*, p. 28. For other instances of Lay Ordination, see Note 83, p. 490, *Coit's Puritanism.*

Thomas Carter was ordained in Worcester in 1642. After the candidate "had exercised in preaching and praying the greater part of the day, two persons, in the name of the Church, laid their hands upon his head, and said, 'We ordain thee, Thomas Carter, to be pastor unto this Church of Christ.' Then one of the neighboring ministers, many of whom were present, prayed."

It is true that ministers among the Congregationalists, are now ordained by councils of ministers. This innovation on the practice of pure Congregationalism, arose from the adoption of the "*Cambridge Platform*" of Church polity, 1648, on the part of the General Court in 1651, (fourteen dissenting,) by which that platform became an organic part of state affairs.

"This Platform makes a Council necessary for ordination, installation, and for the communion of the Churches."

"All Congregational ordinations are virtually laieal; for, as the *first* were so, all the rest must be."

G. (Page 49.)

Some affirm, that while the Baptists had no organized church until the seventeenth century, yet individuals who held Baptist sentiments were scattered throughout Christendom in early ages, and were known as the Albigenses and Waldenses. The Waldenses were a sect, which appeared in the twelfth century, and had a ministry of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*.

H. (Page 57.)

Tertullian, a Presbyter of Carthage, in the second century, is sometimes quoted as authority against infant baptism. It is true he did oppose infant baptism. But why? Because it was a novelty — because it was not Apostolic? O, no; but because he was a follower of a man by the name of Montanus, who called himself "the *Comforter* promised by Christ to His disciples," and pretending to be inspired, had the wicked presumption to say that Christ had conceded too much to the weakness of the people, and so had given an imperfect rule of life. Hence Montanus laid down very severe rules of religion, and Tertullian, being naturally an austere man, embraced his sentiments, and became his ablest defender. Among other strange notions indulged by Tertullian, was this: "That sin after baptism could hardly be pardoned." Hence it was that he argued for the *delay* of the baptism of infants. For the same reason he would have adults of certain dispositions put off the reception of this Sacrament. The very fact of *such* an objection from *such* a man, in *such* an age, is a strong argument in favor of infant baptism, inasmuch as it shows that, in the second century, infant baptism was practised, and was not objected to because it was an innovation, but because of an heretical notion about sin after baptism.

"About a hundred and fifty years after the times of the Apostles, Fidus, an African Bishop, had some doubts whether children ought to be baptized before the eighth day, in order that the Christian ordinance might more correctly correspond with that of Abraham about circum-

cision. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, therefore held a convocation of Bishops, for the purpose of settling this question. At this Synod, sixty-six Bishops assembled, and they came to an unanimous conclusion, that children were eligible to baptism from their birth." It will be observed, that the question was only as to the *time* of baptism, not as to the *fact* whether children were to be baptized or not. If infant baptism were a heresy, introduced at some period subsequent to the time of the Apostles, and that too against both Apostolic precept and Apostolic practice, how is it that in about a hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, sixty-six Bishops should be summoned from their various dioceses, to sit in judgment upon the comparatively insignificant question, whether or not a child should be baptized before it was eight days old; and yet nobody, in that large and learned assembly of Bishops, so far as we are informed, should raise any question as to the infinitely more important fact, whether children should be baptized at all? If infant baptism had been a *new thing*, — an innovation, — a heresy, how came it about that in this *purest* age of Christianity, when every error on its very first appearance was quickly noticed and stoutly resisted, this false doctrine should have become so general, that it had found its way into the districts of at least sixty-six Bishops, not one of whom raised a question, whether infants should be baptized, in a council called expressly to consider a matter pertaining to the subject of infant baptism? At this early period of the Church, errors did not spread so rapidly, nor so powerfully as to silence every orthodox tongue, and at length to be universally admitted and practised, without awaking opposition or arousing controversy.

I. (Page 66.)

"A learned Rabbi tells us that Ezra composed eighteen forms of prayer, which were enjoined by the Great Council, that every man might have them in his mouth;" to which he adds a statement of the custom which prevailed, that the people should say "*Amen*." These eighteen

prayers may be found in "Prideaux's Connections." — *Kip's Double Witness.*

In Horne's Introduction, Vol. III., may be found the following extract from the Jewish Liturgy, with which our Saviour was familiar, and from which He mainly took the petitions embodied in the form which He gave to His disciples: "Our Father, which art in heaven, be gracious unto us, O Lord, our God; hallowed be Thy name, and let the remembrance of Thee be glorified in heaven above, and upon earth here below. Let Thy kingdom reign over us now and forever. The holy men of old said, remit and forgive unto all men, whatsoever they have done against Me. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil thing. For Thine is the kingdom, and Thou shalt reign in glory forever and forevermore."

K. (Page 68.)

Before the Reformation, the Liturgy was only in *Latin*, and was much the same as the present Roman breviary and missal. One of the fruits of the Reformation was the purging of the Liturgy of corrupt innovations, and its translation into English. "Edward VI. appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, with other learned and discreet Bishops and Divines, to draw an order of divine worship, having respect to the pure religion of Christ, taught in the Scripture, and to the practice of the Primitive Church." It was the wish of Cranmer and his associates to retain whatever was sanctioned by Scripture and primitive usage, and to reject nothing but what savored of superstition or tended to errors in doctrine and worship. Many of the collects retained by them, and which now make a part of our Prayer Book, have been used in the public worship of the Church, for fifteen hundred years. The English Prayer Book, substantially as it now is, having been ratified by Convocation and by an Act of Parliament, was used for the first time, by authority, in all the Churches on Whit-Sunday, 1549.

The Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was ratified by the General Conven-

L OF C.

tion, in October, 1789, and does not differ essentially from that of the Church of England.

The services for Festivals and Fasts, which are provided in the Prayer Book, are happily adapted to the necessities of our spiritual nature, and are founded upon the authority of Holy Scripture. Festivals and Fasts were enjoined by God upon the Jews, and were observed by our Lord and His Apostles. Their necessity has been acknowledged by those bodies of Christians, who, in their haste to depart, apparently as far as possible from the Church, undertook to do without them. Thus our Puritan Fathers made it penal to observe Christmas, but ordained a Festival in the Autumn, in the form of a *Thanksgiving Day*. They would not keep the fast of Lent, but they set apart a day in the Spring, as a "day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer."

The Church has, from the early ages, observed a fast of forty days, wherein the ordinary means of grace were used, after an extraordinary manner. Those bodies of Christians who discard this practice, have felt the necessity of such a season, and have virtually confessed it, in that species of substitute found in their "four days' meetings" or "protracted meetings," and other extraordinary services, connected, commonly, with what are known as modern "revivals." We think their own experience is proving that the "*old paths*" are the better way.

L. (Page 79.)

The office of "the Church of the Living God, as the pillar and ground of the truth," is not only to spread that truth, but to *conserve* it. This, the Protestant Episcopal Church does, not only by retaining an Apostolic ministry, but by embodying the great principles of the Gospel, in an *Evangelical Liturgy*. If the minister go astray and become heretical, he cannot easily carry the people with him. Nor can he continue to preach after he ceases to believe in the Divinity of Christ. He must quit the Church at *once* when he quits the faith, since he cannot preach without using the Liturgy, and he cannot do that, after he ceases to believe that Christ is a Divine Being.

In this manner are the people protected against the errors into which their minister may fall.

It has been shown in the sermon that a Liturgy has always obtained in the Church, in connection with an Apostolic ministry; that these were universal for fifteen hundred years, and that, at the present day, of the *two hundred millions* of Christians, *one hundred and eighty* retain the three orders of the ministry and a Liturgy. Heresies have appeared from time to time in the Church. This was foretold by the Saviour and the Apostles. Christ promised to be with His Church, and that "the gates of hell should not prevail against it." This promise has been fulfilled: — they have not prevailed against it. It is a remarkable fact, that of the *one hundred and eighty millions* who retain the Apostolic ministry, of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, there is not, to my knowledge, *a single congregation* who deny the Divinity of Christ.

There is another fact in this connection hardly less remarkable. The great work of the Reformation commenced about the same time in England and on the Continent. In England, the Church was content to cut off what was corrupt, to reform what had been abused, and to *preserve* what was believed to be *Apostolic*. The German reformers also cut off what was corrupt, and reformed what had been abused, but they went one step further: — they rejected *Episcopacy*, — because the Church of Rome pretended the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and had otherwise corrupted the three-fold ministry. Here then was a great experiment. Here were two Reformed Churches: the one holding to an Apostolic Ministry, the other rejecting it. In other respects, there was no essential difference between them. Now, after three hundred years, what is the result? There stands the English Church with her twenty thousand Clergymen, and her Missionaries in every land; the very bulwark of Protestant Christendom, maintaining "the faith once delivered to the saints."

What has become of her who, three hundred years ago, claimed to be a sister, but undertook to put asunder what Apostles had joined together? Where is the faith intrusted to her? She thought it wise to attempt to maintain the Apostolic faith without the Apostolic ministry — thus substituting a plan of her own for the plan of the

Apostles; and where is she now, and what does she teach? At the beginning of the present century a "majority of the divines of the German Churches rejected all belief in the Divine Origin of Christianity." Says an American traveller: "The majority of the Professors in the Universities disbelieve the Revelation of the Old Testament, and regard its authority with no more reverence than that of the Iliad or Æneid." "The Miracles of the Old, and often those of the New Testament, are explained away in conversation and in their lecture rooms; and the inspiration of the Apostles, *and sometimes of Christ, publicly denied.*" "On the subject of the New Testament, there is also the greatest diversity of opinion, though the majority of the Professors, in every department, unite in disbelieving it." The same writer adds: "I believe I am within the bounds of truth in asserting, that there are not five Orthodox Professors and Clergymen in Germany, who esteem the Sabbath in any other light than as a Mosaic Institution." Of the *practical* effects of such teaching the reader can judge for himself. — See *Richardson's Reasons — Stuart's Letters to Channing — Dwight's Travels in Germany — Rose's State of Protestantism in Germany — Robinson's Bib. Rep., Vol. I.*

After the Reformation, in England, another experiment was made. The *Puritans* came forth from the Church of England. They had the Apostolic faith as held by that Church. They were at that time truly Orthodox as to the articles of their belief. But they undertook to maintain that faith without the Apostolic Ministry, and without the aid of a Liturgy. They landed upon these shores and planted the Banner of the Cross in the new world, to be carried forth by an army, without divinely commissioned officers. What has been the result? In about two hundred years the great body of their churches denied "the Lord that bought them." The very Church at Plymouth, which they planted, departed from the faith. There was a time, when there was but a solitary *Congregational* parish, in the city of Boston, that was Orthodox. The very *University*, which Pilgrim hands planted, and Pilgrim piety endowed, became the hot-bed of heresy. And where is the Church of England? Just where she was three hun

dred years ago: firmly holding "the faith once delivered to the saints." I know it is sometimes said, that the King's Chapel, Boston, was the first Episcopal Church which became *Unitarian*. I aver that no Episcopal Church in this country ever did become *Unitarian*. The "King's Chapel" was once an Episcopal Church. When the Revolutionary war broke out, the minister and many of his people, who were loyalists, left the country. It was used, for a while, by the "Old South" Congregation. The property of the former proprietors, who were loyalists, was confiscated. The pews fell into the hands of other people. After peace was declared, a Mr. Freeman applied to Bishop White for ordination, at the same time avowing his *Unitarian* sentiments. Bishop White *could not* ordain him, and would not, if he could — because he was a heretic. What did the people do? They had a meeting of the congregation. They set apart and ordained two of their number as Deacons, — who, in their turn, laid their hands upon Mr. Freeman's head, and he then and there, and thereby, becomes *their* minister. He, in his turn, takes the Prayer Book and riddles it of its vitals, and proceeds with his ministrations. Thus it will be seen, that the "King's Chapel" did not become a *Unitarian* place of worship until it became a CONGREGATIONAL parish. All there is Episcopal about it, are the walls, furniture, and the skeleton of a mutilated Prayer Book.

The Church is the conservator of the "Truth" in another relation. On the opposite side stands the Church of Rome, clothed with great power, and covered with deep corruption. She boasts of her authority — and in a controversy with her, the various denominations invariably come off second best. They unwittingly attack her at a point where she is *strongest* and they are *weakest*. On the other hand, when she tells us that she has an Apostolic commission from Christ, through His Apostles, we answer: "*So have we.*" And we follow up this answer by saying, that we have every thing that she ever had, in the first three centuries; and the difference between us lies, only in those unscriptural doctrines, and practices, which have been added since. What she holds as articles of faith that we do not, are *heresies*, and we can tell her the

time and the place when and where she adopted them. Thus our great advantages in the controversy with Rome, must be manifest to all, who understand what that controversy is.

M. (Page 82.)

By Confirmation, we mean the rite of laying on of hands upon the heads of those who have been baptized, and which is represented by St. Paul as "a principle of the doctrine of Christ." — *Heb.* vi. 2.

When Philip went down to Samaria and preached, many believed, and were baptized by him. As soon as the Apostles at Jerusalem heard of this event, Peter and John went to Samaria, and laid their hands upon these baptized persons. — *Acts* viii. 15–17. So also at Ephesus, St. Paul laid his hands on those who had been baptized. — *Acts* xix. 6.

In the Apostolic age the rite was usually denominated "the laying on of hands;" it is now commonly termed "confirmation," inasmuch as the person who receives this laying on of hands, thereby ratifies and confirms his baptismal vows. It is a profession of his faith before the world. The propriety of such a ceremony must be apparent. That it is Apostolic, there is no dispute. Of its fitness and profit, there are multitudes of witnesses. As none but Apostles performed this rite, so its administration is restricted to their successors, the Bishops of the church. Calvin himself acknowledged that it was practised by the Apostles. In his fourth book of Institutes, he says: "It was an ancient custom, that the children of Christian parents, when they were grown up, should be presented to the Bishop to do that office, which was required of persons who were baptized at adult age." . . . . "Such an imposition of hands as this, which is used purely as a blessing, I very much approve of, and wish it were now restored to its pure and primitive uses."

The following testimony is an extract from the "Report of a Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church." "It appears," say they, "that a rite called Confirmation was administered by the imposition of the hands of the minister, or bishop, or elder, together with

prayer, on baptized children at a certain age." And after quoting the authority of Calvin and others, the committee add: "This rite of Confirmation, thus administered to baptized children when arrived to competent years, and previously instructed and prepared for it, with the express view of their admission to the Lord's Supper, shows clearly that the primitive Church, in her purest days, exercised the authority of a mother over her baptized children." — *Bishop Hobart's Tract on Confirmation.*

The following is from the "Confession of Faith," adopted by a Baptist Association, which met in Philadelphia, Sept. 25, 1742: —

"We believe that laying on of hands, (with prayer,) upon baptized persons as such, is an ordinance of Christ, and ought to be submitted unto by all such persons that are admitted to partake of the Lord's Supper, and that the end of the ordinances is not the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, but for the further reception of the Holy Spirit of promise, or for the addition of the graces of the Spirit, and the influence thereof, to confirm, strengthen, and comfort them in Christ Jesus; it being ratified and established by the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, in the primitive times, to abide in the Church, as meeting together on the first day of the week was, that being the day of worship or Christian Sabbath under the Gospel, and as preaching the Word was, and as Baptism was, and Prayer was, and singing of Psalms, etc., etc., was, and so this of laying on of hands was. For as the whole Gospel was confirmed by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost in general, so was every ordinance in like manner confirmed in particular."

In the Episcopal Church the candidate for Baptism, (if an adult,) for Confirmation and the Lord's Supper, is examined by the Minister, and by him admitted to these privileges, if, in his opinion, the candidate be a proper subject for them. The "keys" were committed to the Apostle, and not to the people. The commission from Christ authorizes and directs his Minister to baptize, and no earthly power can interpose in this matter. A Minister has no moral right to allow laymen to say whom he shall baptize and admit to the Lord's Supper, and whom he shall not. Sheep are not, commonly, shepherds.

N. (Page 86.)

Any person in this diocese may prefer a complaint against a clergyman to the Standing Committee of the diocese, who, after having made a preliminary examination, may, at their discretion, present such clergyman to the Bishop for trial, in which case they are required to make charges and specifications in writing, in the form of a presentment, which presentment is sent to the Bishop, who is required to serve a copy of the same on the accused, with a list of nine Presbyters, from which the accused shall select five, and return the same to the Bishop. The court thus constituted meet at such time and place as the Bishop may appoint. The court declare their decision in writing, together with the sentence, if the accused be found guilty. The sentence is pronounced publicly by the Bishop, in some Church, in the presence of three Presbyters. If the sentence be deposition from the ministry, it is immediately communicated to the Bishops of the several dioceses.

O. (Page 24.)

The Danes were the means of first bringing the Church of Ireland under the sceptre of the Bishop of Rome. "Their second Archbishop of Dublin, A. D. 1074, was the first person who acknowledged subjection in spiritual matters, to any but an Irish Primate. The first assertion of the Pope's supremacy, as extending to Ireland, was made by Pope Gregory VII., A. D. 1074. The first Romish Legate for Ireland, was Gilbert, Bishop of the Danes, in Limerick, A. D. 1106. The first Irish Synod, at which a Papal Legate presided, was that of Rathbreasil in A. D. 1118." "The history of the Irish Church shows clearly that it was independent of Rome till the twelfth century."

LB Ja '10

BX
5
R

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 897 784 4